



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/749,791	12/28/2000	Keiko Neriishi	2016-0166P	6258
2292	7590	01/28/2004	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			CHAKRABARTI, ARUN K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1634	

DATE MAILED: 01/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/749,791

Applicant(s)

Keiko

Examiner

Arun Chakrabarti

Art Unit

1634



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jan 7, 2004
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 6, and 7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 6, and 7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☒ Other: Detailed Action

Art Unit: 1634

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Current status of the Application***

1. Applicant's amendment filed on January 7, 2004 have been amended. Claims 1 and 6 have been amended. Currently claims 1-3 and 6-7 are pending in this application.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CAR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 1634

3. Claims 1-3 and 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) over Some et al. (U.S. Patent 6,256,405 B1) (July 3, 2001) in view of Linsley et al. (U.S. Patent 6,271,002 B1) (August 7, 2001) further in view of Ward et al. (U.S. Patent 4,711,955) further in view of Isoda et al. (U.S. Patent 6,255,660 B1) (July 3, 2001).

Some et al teach a process for detecting a complementary DNA fragment which comprises the steps of:

a) bringing single-stranded sample DNA fragments having a radioactive label in a liquid phase into contact with a group of DNA, so that the complementary DNA fragments are fixed by hybridization to the area in which the group is fixed (Column 7, lines 18-38);

b) removing unfixed sample DNA fragments from the hybridized DNA (Column 7, lines 38-43).

C) keeping the hybridized DNA in contact with a radiation image storage panel containing a stimuable phosphor in areas corresponding to the areas on which groups of DNAs are hybridized, so that the corresponding areas of the stimuable phosphor sheet can absorb and store radiation energy of the radioactive label coming from the fixed DNA fragments through the openings (Figures 1 and 8 and Column 7, lines 43-50);

d) irradiating the radiation image storage panel with a stimulating light, so that the image storage panel releases a stimulated emission from the area in which the radiation energy is stored (Figures 1 and 8 and Column 7, lines 51-67 and Column 8, lines 24-28);

Art Unit: 1634

e) detecting the stimulated emission photoelectrically to obtain a series of electric signals (Figures 1 and 8 and Column 8, lines 1-23 and 29-52);

f) processing the electric signals to locate the area in which the complementary DNA fragments are fixed (Figure 6 and Column 12, lines 21-67).

Some et al teach a process, in which area on the radiation image storage panel other than the area of stimuable phosphor is covered by a barrier member made of ceramic material (Figures 1 and 8 and Column 8, lines 10-23).

Some et al teach a process, in which the irradiation image storage panel is irradiated with a stimulating light after it is separated from the hybridized DNA (Figures 1 and 8 and Column 7, lines 51-67 and Column 8, lines 24-28).

Some et al further teach a method in which a solid support having at least two defined areas, each area having a group of nucleotide derivatives, specifically DNA fragments which page 8, line 6 of the specification notes are within the definition of "nucleotide derivatives", under conditions such that the DNA fragments in one area differ in sequence from the DNA fragments fixed in another area (column 7, lines 20-24). In particular, Some states "a plurality of DNA fragments containing specific gene information are separated and distributed on a gel support medium (column 7, lines 20-24)", followed by transfer to nitrocellulose (column 7).

While Some et al teach the structure required for DNA microarrays, meeting that limitation, Some et al do not discuss the narrow meaning of microarray as a gridded solid support with bound nucleic acids (which limitation, while currently not in the claims, is shown in figure 1).

Art Unit: 1634

Linsley et al teach a process, which comprises a DNA micro-array having at least two defined areas in each of which a group of nucleic acids are fixed under such condition that a group of nucleic acids fixed in one area differs from a group of nucleic acids fixed in another area. (Column 23, line 50 to Column 27, line 24).

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine and substitute DNA micro-array having at least two defined areas in each of which a group of nucleic acids are fixed under such condition that a group of nucleic acids fixed in one area differs from a group of nucleic acids fixed in another area. of Linsley et al. into the DNA image forming method of Some et al. since Linsley et al. state, "One particular useful method of assaying gene expression at the level of transcription employs DNA microarrays (Column 1, lines 53-55)." By employing scientific reasoning, an ordinary artisan would have combined and substituted DNA micro-array having at least two defined areas in each of which a group of nucleic acids are fixed under such condition that a group of nucleic acids fixed in one area differs from a group of nucleic acids fixed in another area of Linsley et al. into the DNA image forming method of Some et al. to improve the process for detecting a complementary DNA fragment. An ordinary practitioner would have been motivated to combine and substitute DNA micro-array having at least two defined areas in each of which a group of nucleic acids are fixed under such condition that a group of nucleic acids fixed in one area differs from a group of nucleic acids fixed in another area of Linsley et al. into the DNA image forming method of Some et al in order to achieve the express advantages , as noted by Linsley et al., of

Art Unit: 1634

one particular useful method of assaying gene expression at the level of transcription that employs DNA microarrays.

Some et al in view of Linsley et al. do not teach a process wherein a group of nucleotide derivatives and analogues are fixed on the microarray.

Ward et al teach a process of using a group of nucleotide derivatives and analogues (Abstract and Claims 1-21).

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine and substitute the method of using a group of nucleotide derivatives and analogues of Ward et al. into the DNA image forming microarray method of Some et al. in view of Linsley et al. since Ward et al. state, "Application include detection and localization of polynucleotide sequences in chromosomes, fixed cells, tissue sections, and cell extracts. Specific applications include chromosomal karyotyping, clinical diagnosis of nucleic-acid containing etiological agents, e.g., bacteria, viruses, or fungi, and diagnosis of genetic disorders (Abstract, last two sentences)." Ward et al provide further motivation as Ward et al. state, "Moreover, these nucleotide derivatives are chemically stable and can be expected to have functional shelf-lives of several years or more. Finally, these compounds permit the development of safer, more economical, more rapid, and more reproducible research and diagnostic procedures (Column 3, lines 11-17)". By employing scientific reasoning, an ordinary artisan would have combined and substituted the method of using a group of nucleotide derivatives and analogues of Ward et al. into the DNA image forming microarray method of Some et al. in view of Linsley et

Art Unit: 1634

al. to improve the process for detecting a complementary DNA fragment. An ordinary practitioner would have been motivated to combine and substitute the method of using a group of nucleotide derivatives and analogues of Ward et al. into the DNA image forming microarray method of Some et al. in view of Linsley et al., in order to achieve the express advantages, as noted by Ward et al., of nucleotide derivatives that are chemically stable and can be expected to have functional shelf-lives of several years or more and which permit the development of safer, more economical, more rapid, and more reproducible research and diagnostic procedures and whose application include detection and localization of polynucleotide sequences in chromosomes, fixed cells, tissue sections, and cell extracts and chromosomal karyotyping, clinical diagnosis of nucleic-acid containing etiological agents, e.g., bacteria, viruses, or fungi, and diagnosis of genetic disorders.

Some et al. in view of Linsley et al. further in view of Ward et al do not teach a radiation image storage panel which has divided stimuable phosphor layers under such condition that the areas of analyte micro-array in which groups of the probe compounds are fixed face the divided stimuable phosphor layers.

Isoda et al. teach a radiation image storage panel which has divided stimuable phosphor layers under such condition that the areas of analyte micro-array in which groups of the probe compounds are fixed face the divided stimuable phosphor layers (Abstract, Figures 1-10, 13 and Examples 1-7, and Column 11, lines 53-65).

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine and substitute a radiation image storage panel which has



Art Unit: 1634

divided stimuable phosphor layers of Isoda et al in the method of Some et al. in view of Linsley et al further in view of Ward et al, since Isoda et al. states, "Consequently, the stimuable phosphor sheet of the invention gives an image of high sharpness at high sensitivity (Column 5, lines 33-35)". By employing scientific reasoning, an ordinary artisan would have combined and substituted a radiation image storage panel which has divided stimuable phosphor layers of Isoda et al in the method of Some et al. in view of Linsley et al further in view of Ward et al, to improve the process for detecting a complementary DNA fragment. An ordinary practitioner would have been motivated to combine and substitute a radiation image storage panel which has divided stimuable phosphor layers of Isoda et al in the method of Some et al. in view of Linsley et al further in view of Ward et al, , in order to achieve the express advantages, as noted by Isoda et al., of the divided stimuable phosphor sheet of the invention which gives an image of high sharpness at high sensitivity.

***Response to Amendment***

4. In response to amendment, previous rejection under 35U.S.C. 103 (a) have been properly maintained with slight modification.

***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments filed on April 30, 2003 with respect to all pending claims have been considered but they are not persuasive.

Art Unit: 1634

Applicant argues on page 7, first paragraph, and page 8, second paragraph, of the Remarks Section that 103(a) rejection should be withdrawn because Some et al., Linsley and Ward references do not teach a radiation image storage panel which has divided stimutable phosphor layers. This argument is not persuasive. It was clearly described in the last office action that Isoda et al teaches this element of the claimed invention. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Applicant then argues (Page 9, lines 1-13) that none of the references discloses the amended element of the claim i.e., in which groups of the analyte face the divided stimutable phosphor layers of the radiation image storage panel. This argument is not persuasive. Isoda et al clearly teaches that the source of fluorescence (stimulating rays), inherently coming from the analyte, faces the divided stimutable phosphor layers of the radiation image storage panel (Figure 13 and Column 11, lines 53-65).

In view of the response to argument, previous rejection with slight modification is hereby properly maintained.

Art Unit: 1634

***Conclusion***

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CAR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CAR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arun Chakrabarti, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (571) 272-0740. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 AM-4:30 PM from Monday to Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion, can be reached on (571) 272-0782. The fax phone number for this Group is (703)872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group analyst Chantae Dessau whose telephone number is (571) 272-0518.

Application/Control Number: 09/749,791

Page 11

Art Unit: 1634

*Arun K. Chakrabarti*

**ARUN K. CHAKRABARTI**

Arun Chakrabarti **PATENT EXAMINER**

Patent Examiner,

January 22, 2004

*Gary Benzion*

**GARY BENZION, PH.D.**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600**